



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,125	10/21/2003	Hitan S. Kamdar	GP-304074 (2760/137)	3644
7590 05/12/2008 General Motors Corporation Mail Code 482-C23-B21 300 Renaissance Center P.O. Box 300 Detroit, MI 48265-3000				
EXAMINER				
HAMZA, FARUK				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2155				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/12/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/690,125

Applicant(s)

KAMDAR ET AL.

Examiner

FARUK HAMZA

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to the communication filed on March 03, 2008.
Claims 1,7,8,14,15 and 21 have been amended. Claims 1-21 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 8-10 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharif et al. (U.S. Patent Number 7,194,513) hereinafter referred as Sharif and further in view of Bastian (U.S. Patent Number 6,757,712) hereinafter referred as Bastian.

Sharif teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a system for using an Internet appliance for sending and receiving digital content files as email attachments includes a system server and an Internet appliance both connected to a communication network (abstract).

As to claim 1, Sharif teaches a method for accessing an email attachment, the method comprising:

receiving an email attachment from a remote server (abstract, Sharif discloses receiving email attachment);

determining a classification of the email attachment (Fig. 4, Column 9, lines 44-60, Sharif discloses identifying attachment types); and

routing the email attachment based on the classification such that the email attachment is provided to communication unit enabled to present the content of the email attachment (Fig. 4, Column 9, lines 44-Column 10, lines 31, Sharif discloses routing email attachment based on identified types).

Sharif does not explicitly teach the claim limitation of establishing the email system at a vehicle.

However, Bastian teaches the claimed limitation of email system at a vehicle (abstract).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary skill of the art at the time of the invention to modify Sharif by adding functionality to establishing the email system at a vehicle, which would allow users to access their email and attachment while they travel. One would be motivated to do such to enhance system's usability and provide greater ease to the users.

Claims 8 and 15 do not teach or define any new limitations other than above claim 1. Therefore, claims 8 and 15 are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 2, Sharif teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising receiving a notification signal at the telematics unit, and setting an internal software flag responsive to the notification signal (Column 9, lines 36-43).

Claims 9 and 16 do not teach or define any new limitations other than above claim 2. Therefore, claims 9 and 16 are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 3, Sharif teaches the method of claim 2 wherein the internal software flag triggers receiving the email attachment at the mobile vehicle telematics unit (Column 9, lines 36-43).

Claims 10 and 17 do not teach or define any new limitations other than above claim 3. Therefore, claims 10 and 17 are rejected for similar reasons.

3. Claims 4, 11 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharif and Bastian as applied above, and further in view of Lazaridis et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,219,694) hereinafter referred as Lazaridis.

As to claim 4, Sharif and Bastian teach the method of claim 1.

Sharif and Bastian do not explicitly teach claim limitation of determining whether the file is an audio-only file and routing the attachment to one of a audio unit or display screen based on the determination.

However, Lazaridis teaches claim limitation of determining whether the file is an audio-only file and routing the attachment to one of a audio unit or display screen based on the determination (Column 6, lines 7-30).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Sharif and Bastian by adding functionality for determining whether the file is an audio-only file and routing the attachment to one of a audio unit or display screen based on the determination, which would provide more effective and accurate delivery of data from host system to users terminal. One would be motivated to enhance system's efficiency.

Claims 11 and 18 do not teach or define any new limitations other than above claim 4. Therefore, claims 5,11,12,18 and 19 are rejected for similar reasons.

4. Claims 6,7,13,14,20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharif and Bastian as applied above, and further in view of Ban et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0060373) hereinafter referred as Ban.

As to claim 6, Sharif and Bastian teaches the method of claim 1.

Sharif and Bastian do not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of storing attachment in random access memory.

However, Ban teaches the claimed limitation of storing attachment in random access memory (P [0012]).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Sharif and Bastian by adding functionality for storing attachment in random access memory, which would allow user to access the attachment faster. One would be motivated to enhance system's efficiency.

As to claim 7, Sharif and Bastian teach the method of claim 6.

Sharif and Bastian do not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of deleting attachment from random access memory.

However, Ban teaches the claimed limitation of deleting attachment from random access memory (P [0012]).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Sharif and Bastian by adding functionality for deleting

attachment from random access memory, which would allow user to store more attachment for faster access. One would be motivated to enhance system's efficiency.

Claims 13, 14, 20 and 21 do not teach or define any new limitations other than above claims 6 and 7. Therefore 13, 14, 20 and 21 are rejected for similar reasons.

5. Claims 5,12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharif, Bastian and Lazaridis as applied above, and further in view of Official Notice.

As to claim 5, Lazaridis teaches the method of claim 4.

Lazaridis does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of setting a bit in a random access memory.

However, "Official Notice" is taken that the concept and advantage of setting a bit in a random access memory is old and well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Sharif, Bastian and Lazaridis by adding functionality for setting a bit in a random access memory, which would provide indication to process. One would be motivated to enhance system's efficiency.

Claims 12 and 19 do not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 5. Therefore, 12 and 19 are rejected for similar reasons.

6. **Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of

the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching of all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

Art Unit: 2155

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Faruk Hamza whose telephone number is 571-272-7969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached at 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 886-217-9197 (toll –free).

Faruk Hamza
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unite 2155

/saleh najjar/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2155

Application Number**Application/Control No.**

10/690,125

Examiner

FARUK HAMZA

**Applicant(s)/Patent under
Reexamination**

KAMDAR ET AL.

Art Unit

2155